DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 918 SO 019 080

AUTHOR Walter, Elizabeth M.
TITLE The Arts in Metropolitan Areas.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 35p.; Paper is part of the "National Metropolitan Area Study" conducted by the University of North Alabama (Florence) in 1987. Thomas P. Thompson was the project director.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Art; *Art Activities; *Arts Centers; Community Development; *Cultural Centers; Culture; *Metropolitan Areas; *Quality of Life; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS Alabama (Florence); *National Metropolitan Area Study; *Places Rated Almanac

ABSTRACT

A consideration of the arts and cultural life is indispensable to any study of the quality of life in U.S. metropolitan areas. However, literature reviews reveal that the arts are often omitted in quality of life studies, and, if included, the assessment may not be derived from sound empirical analysis. This document describes and evaluates "The Places Rated Almanac" ranking variables and measurements of metropolitan arts based on the availability of: (1) museums; (2) public radio; (3) public television; (4) colleges and universities; (5) symphony orchestras; (6) theaters; (7) opera companies; (8) dance companies; and (9) public libraries. An alternative ranking system, based on the National Metropolitan Area Study (NMAS) is described. Strengths and weaknesses in the arts in the Florence (Alabama) metropolitan area are discussed, along with suggestions for improvements and private sector assistance. Suggestions for future research concerning arts availability and observations are made about metropolitan area ranks for the arts. Four tables compare the "Places Rated Almanac" and NMAS ranks for U.S. metropolitan areas above 100,000 population levels, and an appendix defines revised standards for metropolitan statistical areas. (JHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296918

THE ARTS IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Elizabeth M. Walter

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ELIZABETH M. WALTER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO 019080

University of North Alabama
Department of Art
Box 5006
Florence, Alabama 35632-0001

THE ARTS IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Elizabeth M. Walter

Review of Research and Literature

A consideration of the arts and cultural life is indispensable to any study of the quality of life in American metropolitan areas. Yet the review of the literature describing quality of life studies reveals that the arts are often omitted in such research and where included the assessment of the arts is seldom derived from sound empirical analysis.

One author suggests that "there are so few reliable, empirical facts about the linkage between art and society, that decisions are frequently haphazard and foolish." He further contends that "in no other significant field is the existing data base flimsier". (Toffler, 1967, 145-146). On examining studies of cultural life and the arts, it is apparent that such assertions are well supported and that the problem has not been mitigated during the past two decades. Data on the arts are often inaccurate, unreliable, incomplete, or not collected at all.

Some notable exceptions are found in areas where accountability to the federal government is required. Examples include public television, national public radio, and matching grant funds through the National Endowment for the Arts. Data on the arts such as the locations of major museums, dance companies, theatres, opera companies, and symphonies are shown in the publications of various professional organizations for the arts and are considered reliable.

That the arts are not often included in quality of life surveys is demonstrated by Susan L. Cutter in Rating Places: A Geographer's View on

Quality of Life (1985). From selected sources of objective social indicator data, Cutter lists six of the more noted and comprehensive surveys. In Taylor and Jodice's World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators, (1983) and Abler and Adams' Comparative Atlas of America's Great Cities, (1976) no culture or arts variables were included. However, Garwood (1984) included cultural and arts variables. The United States Bureau of the Census (1980) also took the arts into account, but combined the arts with other activities such as leisure, sports, and recreation. The Places Rated Almanac (1981, 1985) survey of metropolitan areas in the United States is one of the few studies that designates a separate category for the arts and shows comprehensive data from reliable sources.

Inattention to the arts in quality of life studies suggests that the arts are not important in the overall quality of American life. However, in examining a list of factors that contribute substantially to the quality of life, the President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties (1980) states succinctly that "when people are asked what contributes to the quality of their lives, the majority of Americans agree about the importance of cultural facilities." The report states that more than nine out of ten people agreed with the statement "things like museums, theatres, and music performances make a community a better place to live." It further points out that more than a third of the people questioned engaged in some type of arts activities "a great deal," and that more than four in five also ranked the arts on a level with other services generally considered essential to community. (President's Commission, p. 29).

The arts do not comprise a peripheral ingredient to the quality of life. The arts are essential for balance and a harmonious integration of values

within a community. Despite the importance of the arts, the commission noted that the combined level of federal funding for the arts and humanities "come to less than one-third that for the National Science Foundation." (President's Commission, p. 29).

Social Indicators III (1980) show data on culture, leisure, and use of time. Some information is also available in that publication on personal consumption expenditures, trends of performing arts audiences, the employment status and occupations of performing arts audiences, museum visitors, the education of performing arts audiences, and museum visitors by types of art form. (Social Indicators, 535-538, 555-556). The small group of selected indicators shown in that study narrowly address an area which the president's commission shows is of critical interest to four out of five Americans.

In contrast to limited federal government interest in collecting data on the quality of life as related to the arts, the academic community appears to exhibit a keener awareness of the contribution of the arts to the quality of life. Ben-Chieh Liu, in Quality of Life Indicators in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: A Statistical Analysis, writes, "it is generally agreed that the more. . . . cultural activities, the higher the community health, the better is the quality of social life." (Liu, p. 73). He derived data from a questionnaire addressed to chambers of commerce for information on cultural activities and institutions.

Gitter and Mostofsky (1973) suggest that a reasonable approach to using social indicators requires both objective and subjective indicators. The authors suggest that the "objective indicators would be used to provide factual information about the quality of life, while the subjective indicators

would inform us how people evaluate their life." Their social indicator measurement model begins with the assumption that a person's life is composed of phenomena which are the elements of everyday existence at a given point in time. Each of those phenomena was designated as a time element, representing a particular aspect of life. The arts ranked third among sixteen variables considered in their study. The use of this technique could add to available research because it widely accepts the sociological premise that for any measure to be considered a valid indicator of quality of life, there must be a clear linkage between that measure and the feelings of the people to whom it is relevant. The present study makes a contribution in that direction.

Toffler (1967) also offered research methods specifically related to the arts in an article, "The Art of Measuring the Arts." Now, nearly twenty years later, Toffler's methods remain valid but, for the most part, are little used. It is with attention to these issues that the literature can be broadened and the data collected, measured, and analyzed to enhance the understanding of the place of the arts in the quality of American life in metropolitan areas.

Yet another methodology for measuring the arts is offered by Judith R. Blau, (1986). She notes that the very assumptions about social and economic conditions that promote the arts in contemporary societies "are, ironically, derived primarily from the scholarship of historians rather than sociologists." According to Blau, the sociology of art has been dominated for many years by attempts to decide if the elite arts have been corrupted by the popular arts, and if the elite arts are "aesthetically and socially reactionary or embody the highest standards of excellence." Despite the

degree of interest in such questions, Blau contends that such assertions cannot be converted to testable propositions. More recent efforts by social scientists have used empirical techniques and theoretical concepts to study art institutions, markets, and producers. But the studies have been limited to a few cases. Thus the absence of comparative research on the availability of arts characterizes the literature. Blau's work, clearly defines what is to be studied: "arts that are distinguished from commercial and popular culture in that they are governed by traditional aesthetic standards and are relatively immune to changing fashion." The availability of commercial arts, based on the study of products, is more readily understood, but Blau is concerned with the existence of institutions. To that end, she focuses on the influences of the political economy, resources of cities, and on their population composition. Blau makes the assumption that "the supply of high culture depends not simply on a taste for it, but especially on the resources that are requisite for institution building." She also notes that while some have theorized that class differences involving culture and the arts have been reduced, the prevailing notion is that culture, by its very nature, is inextricably linked to class differences. Some other factors should be considered in developing a clear concept of the varieties of art that are available in metropolitan areas. The markets and the number of institutions a metropolitan area can support are important. Population size and characteristics are also important. Private sector consideration should include the prevalence of large firms and the concentration of the labor force in the central city.

Toffler (1964, 1967) also demonstrates the shortcomings of previous research in the arts. He notes that the boom in cultural events in the latter

half of the twentieth century brought a resulting expansion in the organizational machinery of the arts. That expansion is shown by numerous institutions devoted to producing or distributing cultural goods and services and new organizations in the form of arts councils and arts centers. These additions to the cultural life of the United States have influenced community affairs in an unprecedented way. Yet, adequate data have not been collected that will aid in understanding the ideological and organizational consequences of decisions by those who control and administer the industry. Because data on the arts have not been well collected, there has not been sufficient measurement of participation in cultural activities, but some distinctive and notable progress in measuring participation in the arts is found in Statistical Abstract of the United States (1986). It has been suggested that the demand for cultural services in a community can be altered by many decisions, but in the past, "major technological and social decisions have been made without regard for their potential impact on the arts." Future studies should take cultural consequences into account. But that can be done only "when we succeed in devising a comprehensive cultural data system with built-in quality indicators." (Toffler, p. 144).

Those quality indicators must, however, be produced along with more thorough quantitative measures. Those quantitative measures must include the differentiation between active participants in artistic endeavors, and those who are spectators of the arts. The absence of such differentiation is one of the greatest deficiencies in the research on the contribution of the arts in quality of life.

Ultimately, as Toffler (1964, p. 230) said in The Culture Consumers, "the creation of art, music, drama, dance, or literature involves not merely

financial expense, but a whole series of complex social arrangements to make it possible." Arguing for the breakdown of barriers that traditionally kept art from the masses, Toffler recalled a concept that can be applied equally to the problems that arise when art has come to the masses, but the data that will keep it there by providing concrete evidence of its use and enjoyment are missing. When government and the private sector do not have data to indicate that funding is improving the quality of life, then funding will most surely be withdrawn.

Theoretical Evaluation

The very idea of measuring and ranking the arts in metropolitan areas is an extremely difficult and complex task. Early humans created visual images of thoughts, feelings, and emotions thousands of years before the invention of architecture, coinage, the wheel, writing, or political systems. The essential nature of the arts is to communicate and to interpret human experiences which are difficult to quantify. The arts are a wholly subjective, if not spiritual, aspect of human life. No society known to history has ever produced a culture without art and that attests to the sublime nature of the arts.

The historical problem of measuring quality of life was recognized by UNESCO (1983) when it was asserted that community welfare and well-being were only new terms for old concepts. The standards for measuring the quality of life have been economically based for centuries. Economists since the mercantilists in the mid-eighteenth century have insisted that there was a simple and direct relationship between economic growth and quality of life. The national welfare was then measured by the balance of precious metals flowing into and out of the country. By the 1960's, the question of utility as

related to social welfare was raised. Social statisticians and sociologists launched the social indicators movement. By the 1970's such research had expanded to include quality of life investigations. The question remains whether or not social indicators research is any nearer to an understanding of social welfare and well-being than the economists of two centuries ago. (UNESCO, p. 11-13). Apart from these methodological problems of quantification, the inclusion of the arts in quality of life studies is a worthwhile and promising endeavor.

The Problem of Measurement and Ranking

The Places Rated measurement of the availability of the arts in metropolitan areas used ten categories and a procedure for awarding points for each category. Because it represents a comphrehensive best effort at quantifying the arts, the Places Rated variables and their measurement are presented in the following paragraphs.

Museums

All museums must comply with the official definition of the American Association of Museums; furthermore, to be included in the assessment each museum must have a minimum of three curators, or equivalents. It must also have a regular publication and/or a library of 5000 volumes or more, although this requirement is waived if the museum has 5 or more curators. All museums meeting the basic criteria receive a base score of 500 points. One hundred points is added to the score for each additional curator over the required minimum of three. The ceiling score for any museum is 2,000 points, which is quite high. Places Rated believes that this high point

potential accurately reflects the tremendous breadth of exhibits and collections of our major museums, as well as their accessibility to the general public.

Fine Arts and Public Radio

Along with public television stations, these facilities offer an endless variety of cultural information and entertainment. Because of the scope of their subject matter and their extreme accessibility, their point potential is high. Radio stations receive from 200 to 500 points each, depending on their weekly broadcast time.

Public Television

Public television stations receive a constant score of 500 points.

Colleges and Universities

Four-year colleges and universities with enrollments of 2,000 students or more and offering at least one degree in the arts are eligible for points. The school's enrollment, divided by 100, is the number of points each institution contributes; universities have a point ceiling of 1,000.

Symphony Orchestras

In the 1985 edition of Places Rated Almanac, from 100 to 500 points are awarded to each type of symphony orchestra recognized by the American Symphony Orchestra League. They are Major, Regional, Metropolitan, Urban Community, College, and Youth. In the Place Profiles, four of the categories are readily identified by the number of stars that follow their names.

Theatres

Nonprofit repertory theatres listed in Theatre Profiles/6 and having annual budgets of $250,000 or more receive points on the basis of their annual operating expenses. In the Places Profiles, the stars following a theatre's name indicate its budget level, and 100 to 500 points are assigned accordingly.

Opera Companies

Opera companies identified in Opera America's Profile: 1983 as current and corresponding members receive a base score of 200 points. To this additional points are awarded according to the number of productions and performances. Some opera companies boast of many performances yet produce only two or three operas each season. To reflect this, the product of productions times performances is added to the base score. For example, the Mobile, Alabama, opera has three productions and ten performances. Thus its score is 200 plus 3 x 10, or 230 points. The ceiling for any opera company is 500 points.

Dance Companies

Places Rated has identified 400 dance companies eligible for inclusion in the Places Profiles, drawing upon Dance Magazine Annual, (1984). Each company so listed is awarded a minimum of 50 points. Additional points are awarde to some dance categories on the basis of the size of the troupe; one or two stars following a company's name in the Place Profiles indicate its troupe size and the number of points awarded. The ceiling for any dance

company is 200 points.

Public Libraries

The points awarded for libraries are determined by their size as expressed in thousands of volumes. America's largest public library system is New York's, with 7,271,592 volumes. The New York metropolitan area therefore receives 7,272 points for its libraries.

Access to Arts Facilities in Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Each of the 76 metropolitan areas that is part of a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) is eligible for bonus points based on certain outstanding or easily shared cultural facilities: major museums receiving 1,000 or more points; all public radio and television stations; four-star (Major) symphonies; theatres receiving one or more stars; all opera companies; and two-star dance companies. A place receives a bonus of 30 percent of the points accumulated by the other metropolitan areas in the CMSA for these facilities; a metropolitan area's own points are not considered in calculating its bonus.

Evaluation of Places Rated Methodology

Neil Cheek, (1986), points out in an unpublished manuscript that the Places Rated indices of the arts include people, objects, organizations, and performances, but "there is no logic by which something is or is not to be included. Different things are being added as if they were all equally valid indices of the conceptualization."

The measurement and weighting of the arts variables in Places Rated, as shown, does not permit each category to vary within the same range. As a

result, some components necessarily and disproportionately contribute to the overall score. Yet, the study undertakes to be a quantitative measurement of the arts as they relate to the quality of life. Even quantitative measures are suspect when not equitably compared. This can be demonstrated by the wide variation in measuring arts, as some offerings are rated by number of performances and productions, some by number of members, and some by size of budget. Other arbitrary designations are evident. For example, a symphony orchestra receives from 100 points for a community orchestra to 500 points for a "major" one. That discrepancy apparently means the major orchestra is worthy of greater credit based on some unknown subjective judgement.

An Alternative Measurement and Weighting Scheme for the Arts

In the methodology employed here, fine arts radio, public radio, and public television are excluded because their broadcasts are available in virtually every metropolitan area and are therefore universal and constant. Further justification for exclusion of this important cultural activity is that viewing and listening of such programs is within homes, while all other categories measured in Places Rated require attendance at facilities outside the home.

In addition, access to arts facilities in consolidated metropolitan statistical areas is not measured in this study. While theoretically sound, more work needs to be done on the measurement of access. All measures pertain to arts facilities within metropolitan area boundaries. Libraries are measured in the recreation chapter and the broader role of universities is considered in the chapter on education. The net result of making such deletions is that the variables that are measured in this section on the arts have a common denominator and thus can be combined into a useful index for

the availability of the arts in metropolitan areas.

In an attempt to correct these and other deficiencies, the weighting scheme in this study is based not on points but on participation rates from the Statistical Abstract of the United States (1986). Those weights are shown in Table 1.1. When a metropolitan area is recognized as having facilities in a measurable category (museum, symphony), it is given a weighted score based on the values in the table. Scores were then summed to determine overall standing of metropolitan areas. While larger cities tend to be rewarded for the presence of all variables, smaller cities did not suffer from the smaller acquisitions budgets of their museums or operating budgets of their ballet companies.

TABLE 1.1

STATISTICAL WEIGHTS USED IN THE NATIONAL METROPOLITAN AREA STUDY FOR THE ARTS

Category	Weights by Participation in Percents
Museums	22.0
Orchestras	13.0
Theatres	31.0
Dance Companies	4.0
*University Productions	2.0

Sources: Social Indicators, U.S. Department of Commerce 1977 and Statistical Abstract of the United States. U.S. Department of Commerce 1986.

Issues of Validity and Reliability

In characterizing the issues of validity and reliability of the Places Rated study, it is necessary to point out the lack of precision and what appears to be an inherent bias in weighting the arts variables. The extent to which they measure quality of life through the arts is not immediately

apparent. Their design for the section on the arts on the surface appears reasonable, but the superficial manner in which the statistics were applied does not adequately show the availability or participation in the arts in the metropolitan areas. It is as if their measurements behaved the way they expected them to perform. The Places Rated measurement may not be a valid model for future research on the arts. The measurement model used in this study may present a more valid and reliable approach for future research.

A comparison between the 1981 and 1985 editions of the Places Rated Almanac reveals considerable change in measurement of the arts. The fault in their procedure is in determining validity by the black-box method which, according to Judith de Neufville, was "designed operationally, rather than on the basis of a prior concept. It is meaningless to even think about validity without a precise concept against which to match a measure. Not to have any feeling about validity of a measure is to be unable to use it with confidence and expect it to behave predictably in new situations" (De Neufville, p. 163-164). In short, Boyer and Savageau, in the 1985 edition, changed the measurement procedure shown in the 1981 edition but little improvement was realized. Even more problematic for reliability is that Places Rated did not indicate in the 1985 text that they had changed their measurement model by eliminating peripheral data that altered the rankings of metropolitan areas between the 1981 and 1985 studies. Arbitrary changes in the measurements caused the ranking of the Florence, Alabama area for the arts to drop from 162 in 1981 to 227 in 1985. Consequently, while the quality of life for the arts in metropolitan areas did not change between 1981 and 1985, but the changes in measurement give that impression.

The Arts in the Shoals

One of the strengths of The Arts in the Shoals--Florence Metropolitan Area is its diversity of fine arts institutions. No less than six nonprofit theatre groups, Center Stage, Zodiac Players, Gingerbread Players, the Florence Summer Music Theatre, U.N.A. drama department, and Ivy Green produce a variety of productions in The Ritz Theatre, the Zodiac Playhouse, Norton Auditorium, and other amenable locations. Two symphonic organizations, the Muscle Shoals Concert Association and the Shoals Symphony offer touring and locally produced performances throughout the year. Three public nonprofit art galleries exist: the Tennessee Valley Art Center, the Kennedy-Douglass Center for the Arts, and the University Art Gallery at U.N.A. All sponsor national, regional, and local exhibitions. Interest in art and artifacts can also be measured in terms of attendance figures at Ivy Green, the Helen Keller Birthplace and Museum; the W.C. Handy Home and Museum; Pope's Tavern; and the Indian Mound Museum. The Florence Ballet Company contributes greatly to the dance performances available to the area. And, among the most important of the arts institutions available, WFIQ-TV provides a full schedule of PBS programming throughout the year. An NPR affiliate with a 20,000 watt transmitter, operating an a frequency of 88.7 FM with a 20 kilometer range is scheduled to begin broadcasting pending FCC approval.

The area lacks an opera company and an art museum with representative substantial holdings. Despite its strengths, much work remains to be done in the Arts in Florence, which declined in rank to 102nd place from the adjusted Places Rated rank of 70.

Suggestions for Improving Rankings of the Shoals

In keeping with the operational definition on which this study is based, steps that can be taken to improve the Shoals ranking are:

1. Organize a united arts council that serves as an umbrella agency in the manner of the United Way. The council would give greater visibility to the diverse cultural life in the Shoals and focus attention on data collection for funding purposes.

2. Arts organizations should join accrediting professional organizations that, by virtue of membership, will include them in national rankings and ratings. The lack of membership seriously affected the ranking of the Shoals.

3. Organizations should apply for National Endowment of Arts grants, not just state-funded grants. Alabama is indexed in the National Endowment for the Arts funding over the past years as having received substantial grants. All, however, have been awarded to only five metropolitan areas in the state: Huntsville, Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, Mobile, and Montgomery.

4. Establish an art museum as a repository for historically valued masterpieces and recognized contemporary works of art.

5. "Florence - A Renaissance City," the slogan of Downtown Florence Unlimited, would profit by reflecting the essence of Florence, Italy, in sponsoring representative reproductions of sculpture pieces by Donatello, Verrocchio, and Michelangelo placed in context about the city. This is not out of reach for smaller cities. For example, Rome, Georgia has an exact bronze reproduction of the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus from Rome, Italy, and the work is a great tourist attraction and source of civic pride. Sister city status with Florence, Italy should be investigated.

Suggestions for Private Sector Investment and Initiative

An excellent example of private sector investment in the Deep South is the city of Memphis. Memphis State University (M.S.U.), which received a grant from Colgate Palmolive's chief executive officer, E.H. Little, formed with the city a cooperative effort to establish the Institute of Egyptian Art and Archaeology, (IEAA). With the grant, M.S.U. purchased 44 Egyptian

antiquities from the Boston Museum of Arts and established the IEAA. From this beginning, the city of Memphis has developed a highly comprehensive tourism and marketing strategy to promote the presence of the Egyptian artifacts and the link between ancient Egypt and modern-day Memphis. The thrust began after the 1983 exhibit, "A Divine Tour of Ancient Egypt," which drew more than 20,000 people to the University Gallery of Memphis State University. An even larger exhibit of Ramses, with cooperative sponsorship between the private sector and the university, is planned for the near future.

There is no question that support for the arts needs to come from local corporations or from a unified effort of the private sector. Federal and state funding is sparse. Memphis, Tennessee has bridged this transition between private sector investment and initiative through the generosity of one corporate sponsor: Colgate Palmolive. Other funds were then attracted to enlarge the initial corporate effort. The same effort can be made in Florence. In other words, what is "Florence - A Renaissance City" without a de Medici, a family of merchant princes in fifteenth century Florence, Italy, who valued art above all commodities.

Because of the commitment to economic development in the Shoals area it is reasonable to assume that a variety of corporate sponsors would pledge their support to the arts. Such support will show civic concern for the quality of life of the area, and contribute to the preservation and affirmation of cultural values for future generations. Practically speaking, it can be assumed it is good business and good public relations for a corporate entity to be identified as a supporter of cultural institutions and the arts. Corporate funds in support of art institutions generally increase programs,

stimulate acquisitions, and provide employment for qualified professional arts personnel.

Suggestions for Future Research

The major problem that needs to be solved in this type of research is reliable quantitative data based on participation, the producer/artists, possessions - major or minor - and productivity. The United States Census Bureau is a logical entity to collect this information as the chief data source for activities in the United States, whether health, education, economics, or the arts. Since no reliable comprehensive data-gathering agency exists, other than the U.S. Census Bureau, it would seem logical for that agency to gather more elaborate information about the quality of life as related to arts participation and availability. Furthermore, when such information becomes available, it would seem to be important for sociologists, arts administrators, and art historians to work in a cooperative effort to make sound interpretive judgements on an interdisciplinary basis, rather than confining research methodology to an individual discipline. Sound decisions on the arts cannot be based on incomplete and inconclusive information from any one perspective.

The suggestions for future research will require an effort that exceeds the present effort. However, in the brief overview it is apparent that extended analysis would reveal even greater discrepancies than those pointed out in this study. It seems important to develop accurate secondary sources of data dealing with facilities beyond those listed in professional membership associations. Symphonies that do not belong to the American Symphony Orchestra League, theatres that are not part of the Theatre Magazine

annuals, and minor museums that may not be listed in the official museum directory should be documented. Another area which seems to require attention in future studies is participation. Some means of accurately and consistently measuring the number of people who take part in cultural activities as spectators or performers is clearly needed. Yet another objective, once the quantitative methodology is intact, would be to determine a means for making a qualitative analysis of the cultural offerings in the nation.

One of the concerns of this study has been the manner in which public television and public radio should be included. Inasmuch as these media are the most accessible cultural activity within reach of anyone living almost anywhere in the United States, it would seem desirable to include them in a weighting scheme. However, their virtual universal presence in the metropolitan areas under study has led to their exclusion here. It should be recognized, however, that the current methodology is essentially elitist in its design. When considered for export to smaller metropolitan areas and more rural areas, the development of a more democratic instrument, which takes accessibility of public television and public radio into account when measuring quality of life would seem to be essential. Development of such an instrument would continue the philosophical shift from the elitist focus of the Places Rated methodology. Already democratized by use of participation rates as the weighting factor in this study, inclusion of the universally accessible media in the measurement scheme would complete the shift.

Observations on the Metropolitan Area Ranks for the Arts

Among the most interesting outcomes of the application of the NMAS

methodology to the Arts, is the percentage of ties existing within population levels. Among level A metropolitan areas, there are no ties; for level B areas there are 34% ties; for level C areas there are 57%; and for level D areas there are nearly 69% ties. It is apparent that the number of ties decline with the increasing population size of the metropolitan area. There is probably no great difference in the availability of participation opportunities within the arts in the smaller metropolitan areas. True ties are wholly expected. It is curious there are none in The Places Rated Almanac. The ties adequately and properly show that some metropolitan areas are similar in the availability of arts facilities. The areas which tied at the 289 ranking have only a public library facility. Since public libraries were excluded as a variable in the National Metropolitan Area Study arts measurement, this a priority placed those cities at the bottom of the total rankings.

The Kendall Tau B coefficient of correlation shows the degree of similarity between the measure and weighting of the National Metropolitan Area Study and that of Places Rated. For level A areas that correlation is .70, for level B areas it is .46, for level C areas .49, and for level D areas, .52. In concluding this chapter four tables are presented showing the availability of the arts in metropolitan areas. Table 2.2 shows the ranks for Level A areas, table 2.3 shows the ranks for level B areas, table 2.4 shows the arts ranks for level C areas, and the ranks for Level D areas are shown in table 2.5.

TABLE 2.2

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 1 MILLION OR MORE (N=40)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA	32	28	4
Atlanta, GA	26	18	8
Baltimore, MD	15	12	3
Bergen-Passaic, NJ	18	32	-14
Boston, MA	5	5	0
Buffalo, NY	23	29	-6
Chicago, IL	2	2	0
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	16	22	-6
Cleveland, OH	9	15	-6
Columbus, OH	28	30	-2
Dallas, TX	13	11	2
Denver, CO	24	21	3
Detroit, MI	14	17	-3
Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood-Pompano Beach, FL	40	40	0
Houston, TX	11	14	-3
Indianapolis, IN	30	26	4
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	3	3	0
Miami-Hialeah, FL	36	31	5
Milwaukee, WI	21	19	2
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	10	7	3
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	22	34	-12
New Orleans, LA	25	27	-2
New York, NY	1	1	0
Newark, NJ	8	20	-12
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA	27	23	4
Oakland, CA	31	16	15
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	6	9	-3
Phoenix, AZ	37	25	12
Pittsburgh, PA	12	10	2

TABLE 2.2

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 1 MILLION OR MORE (N=40)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Portland, OR	34	39	-5
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	33	36	-3
Sacramento, CA	38	38	0
St. Louis, MO-IL	19	24	-5
San Antonio, TX	39	36	3
San Diego, CA	20	13	7
San Francisco, CA	7	6	1
San Jose, CA	29	33	-4
Seattle, WA	17	8	9
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	35	35	0
Washington, DC-MD-VA	4	4	0

TABLE 2.3

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 250,000 TO 1 MILLION (N=119)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Akron, OH	15	71	-56
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	23	13	10
Albuquerque, NM	27	24	3
Allentown-Bethlehem, PA-NJ	72	31	41
Alton-Granite City, IL	95	114	-19
Ann Arbor, MI	6	4	2
Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	101	99	2
Atlantic City, NJ	116	110	6
Augusta, GA-SC	104	92	12
Aurora-Elgin, IL	39	65	-26
Austin, TX	18	37	-19
Bakersfield, CA	99	99	0
Baton Rouge, LA	34	60	-26
Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	87	94	-7
Binghamton, NY	92	80	8
Birmingham, AL	38	36	2
Bridgeport-Milford, CT	1	98	-97
Canton, OH	110	77	33
Charleston, SC	54	53	1
Charleston, WV	66	32	34
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rockhill, NC-SC	31	45	-14
Chattanooga, TN-GA	69	93	-24
Colorado Springs, CO	90	59	31
Columbia, SC	68	73	-6
Corpus Christi, TX	81	65	16
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, IA-IL	107	61	46
Dayton-Springfield, OH	9	9	0
Daytona Beach, FL	113	105	8
Des Moines, IA	85	27	58
Duluth, MN-WI	71	99	-28
East St. Louis-Belleville, IL	111	116	-5

TABLE 2.3

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 250,000 TO 1 MILLION (N=119)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
El Paso, TX	40	23	17
Erie, PA	80	82	-2
Eugene-Springfield, OR	65	58	7
Evansville, IN-KY	84	82	2
Flint, MI	77	68	9
Fort Wayne, IN	59	91	-32
Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	11	6	5
Fresno, CA	44	73	-29
Gary-Hammond, IN	37	86	-49
Grand Rapids, MI	50	44	6
Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point, NC	36	21	15
Greenville-Spartanburg, SC	70	54	16
Hamilton-Middletown, OH	73	73	0
Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle, PA	53	33	20
Hartford, CT	43	14	29
Honolulu, HI	7	17	-10
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	75	67	8
Jackson, MS	51	50	1
Jacksonville, FL	78	85	-7
Jersey City, NJ	5	114	-109
Johnson City-Kingsport Bristol, TN-VA	83	27	56
Johnstown, PA	114	82	32
Joliet, IL	52	116	-64
Kansas City, KS	100	99	1
Kansas City, MO	16	16	0
Knoxville, TN	48	64	-16
Lake County, IL	42	86	-44
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	119	86	33
Lancaster, PA	108	113	-5
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	35	29	6
Las Vegas, NV	93	77	16

TABLE 2.3

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 250,000 TO 1 MILLION (N=119)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Lawrence-Haverhill, MA-NH	79	116	-37
Lexington-Fayette, KY	44	70	-26
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	76	47	29
Lorain-Elyria, OH	67	110	-43
Louisville, KY-IN	22	20	2
Macon-Warner Robins, GA	96	61	35
Madison, WI	19	13	6
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	98	94	4
Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay, FL	118	106	12
Memphis, TN-AR-MS	28	26	2
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ	2	35	-33
Mobile, AL	89	112	-23
Modesto, CA	115	109	6
Monmouth-Ocean, NJ	4	51	-47
Montgomery, AL	97	94	3
Nashville, TN	30	21	9
New Haven-Meriden, CT	3	1	2
New London-Norwich, CT-RI	102	56	46
Oklahoma City, OK	24	30	-6
Omaha, NE-IA	41	11	30
Orange County, NY	10	106	-96
Orlando, FL	64	49	13
Oxnard-Ventura, CA	62	86	-24
Pawtucket-Woonsocket-Attleboro, RI-MA	117	116	1
Pensacola, FL	82	99	-17
Peoria, IL	74	73	1
Providence, RI	12	5	7
Raleigh-Durham, NC	13	10	3
Reading, PA	103	99	4
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	14	3	11
Rochester, NY	8	2	6

TABLE 2.3

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 250,000 TO 1 MILLION (N=119)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Rockford, IL	105	40	65
Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI	91	48	43
Salem-Gloucester, MA	49	46	3
Salinas-Seaside-Monterey, CA	109	56	53
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	17	12	5
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA	63	61	2
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	47	77	-30
Scranton-Wilkes Barre, PA	86	81	5
Shreveport, LA	60	90	-30
Spokane, WA	55	71	-16
Springfield, MA	46	7	39
Stockton, CA	94	94	0
Syracuse, NY	20	19	1
Tacoma, WA	32	24	8
Toledo, OH	29	37	-8
Trenton, NJ	21	42	-21
Tucson, AZ	23	17	6
Tulsa OK	33	8	25
Utica-Rome, NY	112	69	43
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA	57	106	-49
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Delray Beach, FL	58	39	19
Wichita, KS	56	54	2
Wilmington, DE-NJ-MD	26	34	-8
Worcester, MA	88	43	45
York, PA	106	40	66
Youngstown-Warren, OH	61	51	10

TABLE 2.4

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 100,000 TO 250,000 (N=140)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Abilene,TX	71	53	18
Albany, GA	120	72	48
Alexandria, LA	109	72	37
Altoona, PA	119	72	47
Amarillo, TX	63	54	9
Anchorage, AK	19	8	11
Anderson, IN	100	72	28
Anderson, SC	123	111	12
Anniston, AL	115	30	85
Asheville, NC	53	54	-1
Athens, GA	8	4	4
Battle Creek, MI	107	72	35
Beaver County, PA	58	111	-53
Bellingham, WA	57	102	-45
Benton Harbor, MI	137	111	26
Billings, MT	81	72	9
Biloxi-Gulfport, MS	89	111	-22
Bloomington-Normal, IL	48	54	-6
Boise City, ID	17	10	7
Boulder-Longmont, CO	7	2	5
Bradenton, FL	126	111	15
Brazoria, TX	47	111	-64
Bremerton, WA	103	72	31
Brockton, MA	29	111	-92
Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	125	111	14
Burlington, VT	40	33	13
Cedar Rapids, IA	75	37	38
Champaign-Urbana-Rantoul, IL	23	26	-3
Charlottesville, VA	51	33	18
Chico, CA	41	102	-61
Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	132	111	21

TABLE 2.4

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 100,000 TO 250,000 (N=140)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Columbia, MO	13	18	-5
Columbus, GA-AL	35	18	17
Cumberland, MD-WV	105	102	3
Danbury, CT	2	15	-13
Danville, VA	135	111	24
Decatur, IL	113	72	41
Dothan, AL	131	111	20
Eau Claire, WI	37	33	4
Elkhart-Goshen, IN	108	72	36
Fall River, MA-RI	85	72	13
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN	26	54	-28
Fayetteville, NC	77	54	23
Fayetteville-Springdale, AR	33	54	-21
Florence, AL	70	102	-32
Florence, SC	90	111	-21
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	44	54	-10
Fort Myers, FL	104	72	32
Fort Pierce, FL	106	111	-5
Fort Smith, AR-OK	129	72	57
Fort Walton Beach, FL	134	100	34
Gadsden, AL	127	111	16
Gainesville, FL	10	4	6
Galveston-Texas City, TX	39	72	-33
Glen Falls, NY	91	52	39
Greeley, CO	62	102	-40
Green Bay, WI	15	18	-3
Hagerstown, MD	78	72	6
Hickory, NC	122	72	50
Houma-Thibodaux, LA	86	102	-16
Huntsville, AL	32	26	6
Jackson, MI	111	72	39

TABLE 2.4

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 100,000 TO 250,000 (N=140)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Jacksonville, NC	93	111	-18
Janesville-Beloit, WI	67	54	13
Joplin, MO	136	111	25
Kalamazoo, MI	28	26	2
Kankakee, IL	138	111	27
Kenosha, WI	5	54	-49
Killeen-Temple, TX	74	111	-37
Kokomo, IN	114	72	42
Lafayette, IN	21	10	11
Lafayette, LA	38	54	-16
Lake Charles, LA	49	44	5
Lawton, OK	59	18	41
Lima, OH	54	18	36
Lincoln, NE	4	1	3
Longview-Marshall, TX	109	37	72
Lowell, MA-NH	11	25	-14
Lubbock, TX	9	18	-9
Lynchburg, VA	68	51	17
Manchester, NH	98	72	26
Mansfield, OH	94	37	57
Medford, OR	36	13	23
Monroe, LA	46	102	-56
Muncie, IN	16	54	-38
Muskegon, MI	95	37	58
Nashua, NH	25	14	11
New Bedford, MA	82	24	58
New Britain, CT	55	54	1
Niagara Falls, NY	73	111	-38
Norwalk, CT	3	7	-4
Ocala, FL	117	72	45
Odessa, TX	118	72	46

TABLE 2.4

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 100,000 TO 250,000 (N=140)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Olympia, WA	87	72	15
Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH	133	111	22
Pascagoula, MS	84	111	-27
Portland, ME	18	10	8
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME	124	30	94
Poughkeepsie, NY	80	36	44
Provo-Orem, UT	30	54	-24
Pueblo, CO	56	54	2
Racine, WI	65	72	-7
Redding, CA	76	72	4
Reno, NV	22	9	13
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	95	72	23
Roanoke, VA	61	72	-11
St. Cloud, MN	34	54	-20
Salem, OR	88	111	-23
Santa Cruz, CA	6	26	-20
Sarasota, FL	79	6	73
Savannah, GA	20	15	5
Sharon, PA	140	111	29
Sheboygan, WI	115	111	4
Sioux City, IA-NE	52	37	15
Sioux Falls, SD	99	72	27
South Bend-Mishawaka, IN	14	46	-32
Springfield, IL	31	17	14
Springfield, MO	42	32	10
Stamford, CT	1	3	-2
State College, PA	60	47	13
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV	128	111	17
Tallahassee, FL	24	47	-23
Terre Haute, IN	64	54	10
Texarkana, TX-AR	139	111	28

TABLE 2.4

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF 100,000 TO 250,000 (N=140)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Topeka, KS	43	101	-58
Tuscaloosa, AL	50	102	-52
Tyler, TX	102	37	65
Vancouver, WA	45	45	0
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	27	111	-84
Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA	97	111	-13
Waco, TX	66	54	12
Waterbury, CT	112	50	62
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	12	54	-42
Wausau, WI	83	111	-28
Wheeling, WV-OH	101	72	29
Wichita Falls, TX	92	47	45
Williamsport, PA	121	72	49
Wilmington, NC	69	102	-33
Yakima, WA	71	37	34
Yuba City, CA	130	111	19

TABLE 2.5

A COMPARISON OF RANKS FOR THE ARTS AMONG METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH POPULATIONS OF UNDER 100,000 (N=30)

Metropolitan Area	Adjusted Places Rated Rank	NMAS Rank	Net Difference
Bangor, ME	6	7	-1
Bismarck, ND	10	11	-1
Bloomington, IN	4	6	-2
Bristol, CT	18	24	-6
Bryan-College Station, TX	5	9	-4
Burlington, NC	28	24	4
Casper, WY	23	11	12
Dubuque, IA	22	11	11
Elmira, NY	11	7	4
Enid, OK	26	11	14
Fitchburg-Leominster, MA	24	24	0
Grand Forks, ND	7	9	-2
Great Falls, MT	20	11	9
Iowa City, IA	3	21	-18
Lacrosse, WI	8	2	6
Laredo, TX	27	11	16
Las Cruces, NM	2	3	-1
Lawrence, KS	1	1	0
Lewiston-Auburn, ME	16	24	-8
Middletown, CT	17	21	-4
Midland, TX	19	11	8
Owensboro, TX	13	11	2
Panama City, FL	15	24	-9
Pine Bluff, AR	21	21	0
Pittsfield, MA	25	20	5
Rochester, MN	14	11	3
St. Joseph, MO	12	5	7
San Angelo, TX	9	3	6
Sherman-Denison, TX	30	24	6
Victoria, TX	29	24	5

APPENDIX A

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1980 Census of Population. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget in 1983) Washington, D.C.: GPO. December 1984. PC80-S1-18.

THE NEW METROPOLITAN AREA DEFINITIONS

REVISED STANDARDS FOR METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

Standard definitions of metropolitan statistical areas are issued by the Office of Management and Budget to be used in the presentation of statistics by agencies of the Federal Government. OMB establishes the geographic definition of each area following detailed technical criteria developed with the advice of the Federal Committee on Metropolitan Statistical Areas, which is composed of representatives of the major Federal statistical agencies.

The general concept underlying these definitions is that of a geographic area consisting of a large population nucleus together with adjacent communities having a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. In effect, the definitions specify a boundary around each large city that includes most or all suburbs in addition to the city itself. Most definitions also include smaller satellite communities and some open country, since entire counties generally form the MSA building blocks. Some areas are defined around two, three, or more central cities.

Standard metropolitan definitions were first developed for the 1950 census and have been updated after each subsequent decennial census. The criteria used for defining MSA's have also been revised several times. The current definitional standards were published in the *Federal Register* on January 3, 1980.

The major purpose of the MSA's is to enable all Federal agencies to use the same geographic definitions in tabulating and publishing data for metropolitan areas. MSA's are defined in terms of counties because these are the smallest geographical units for which a wide range of statistical data can be obtained. In New England, however, the definitions are in terms of cities and towns because these subcounty units are of great local significance and considerable data are available for them.

The definitions are designed to serve a wide variety of statistical and analytical purposes. Use of the areas for any specific purpose should be judged in terms of the appropriateness of the definitional criteria for that purpose. While the definitions have been developed for statistical use by Federal agencies, State and local governments as well as private business firms have often found the definitions helpful in presenting metropolitan statistics.

By current standards, an area qualifies for recognition as an MSA in one of two ways: if there is a city of at least 50,000 population, or a Census Bureau-defined urbanized area of at least 50,000 with a total metropolitan population of at least 100,000 (75,000 in New England). In addition to the county containing the main city, an MSA also includes additional counties having strong economic and social ties to the central county, determined chiefly by the extent of the Census urbanized area and census data on commuting to work. A metropolitan statistical area may contain more than one city of 50,000 population and may cross State lines.

The 1983 definitions in this publication reflect application of the published MSA standards to demographic data drawn from the 1980 decennial census. All metropolitan area definitions were reconsidered in the course of this revision process (which takes place every 10 years), and certain terminology changes were also made. The previous term "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area" (SMSA) was shortened to "Metropolitan Statistical Area" (MSA).

If an area has more than one million population and meets certain other specified requirements, it now is termed a "Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area" (CMSA), consisting of major components recognized as "Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas" (PMSA's). Many of these PMSA's were formerly recognized as SMSA's; the majority were also included in a set of "standard consolidated statistical areas" defined by OMB beginning in 1975, each of which consisted of two or more closely associated SMSA's. Metropolitan areas not included in CMSA's are designated simply as metropolitan statistical areas (MSA's). For users who cannot obtain subcounty data for New England, 16 New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMA's) are also defined.

Most metropolitan statistical areas are in a single State, but the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA extends into 4 States, and 3 CMSA's, 2 PMSA's, and 3 MSA's are in 3 States each, while as of 1983 5 CMSA's, 6 PMSA's, and 23 MSA's extended into 2 States each; as of 1984, the counts of two-state areas changed to 3 CMSA's and 25 MSA's. Every State now has at least one MSA; New Jersey and the District of Columbia are wholly included in CMSA's or MSA's. One CMSA (comprising two PMSA's) and four MSA's are located in Puerto Rico.

MSA's, PMSA's, and NECMA's are categorized by their 1980 population size, as follows:

Level A—Areas of 1 million or more
Level B—Areas of 250,000 to 1 million
Level C—Areas of 100,000 to 250,000
Level D—Areas of less than 100,000